

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have received the Office action dated August 10, 2006, in which the Examiner: 1) withdrew claims 25-37 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b); 2) rejected claims 1, 2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 4,288,860 ("Trost") in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0067847 ("Silvester"); 3) rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trost in view of Silvester and further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0172325 ("Wyatt"); and 4) objected to claims 6-9 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but otherwise allowable.

With this Response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, 25, 26, 31, and 34. Also, Applicants canceled claims 5 and 6. Based on the amendments and arguments, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 2, 4, 7-9 and 25-37.

I. RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

The Examiner withdrew claims 25-37 as being directed to a non-elected invention. While Applicants disagree with the Examiner, claim 25 has been amended to recite "the storage controller selectively turns off the error correction logic based on an amount of data in the buffer" to expedite prosecution and allowance of claims 25-37. This limitation defines a condition under which to enter a power saving mode and thus corresponds to the species being examined as set forth by the Examiner (see Office Action dated 08/10/06, page 3). The Examiner also suggested this limitation is allowable (see Office Action dated 08/10/06, page 6). For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request entrance of the amendments to withdrawn claims 25, 26, 31 and 34, and allowance of the withdrawn claims 25-37.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER § 103


Claim 1 was amended to incorporate the limitations of canceled claim 6, which the Examiner indicated was allowable if written in independent form. For at least this reason, claims 1, 2, 4 and 7-9 are allowable.

III. CONCLUSIONS

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,


Alan D. Christenson
PTO Reg. No. 54,036
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
AGENT FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400